

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

15

R.A.No. 113/93 in
O.A.No. 94/92

Date of decision 12.5.93

Shri B.K. Batra

... Petitioner

vs.

Union of India & another

... Respondents

ORDER

The applicant in OA No. 94 of 1992 decided on 9-2-1993, has filed this petition for review of the aforesaid judgement. He has named this petition as Misc. Petition under Section 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal(Procedure) Rules, 1987. This is obviously a mistake inasmuch as a Misc. Petition is filed under Rule 8(3) and not under Section 17 and that it is a petition for review and not a Misc. Petition. Be that as it may, we have treated this petition as an Application for review under Rule 17 of the Central Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1987.

2. The points raised by the applicant in this Review Application have been fully dealt with in the judgement dated 9-2-1993 which is sought to be reviewed. Now the only new thing which he has done is to have enclosed a copy of letter No. 729-P/34/1197-P.1 dated May, 1992 (Annexure 'B') to the R.A. According to this letter, his pay earlier fixed w.e.f. 16-5-1988 has now been revised with effect from 16-9-88. He has not filed even now a copy of the letter/order/notice

16

by which his pay was earlier fixed and has now been revised by letter of May, 1992. The judgement clearly reveals the contentions of the rival party in regard to the date of fixation of the pay of the applicant and the conclusion arrived at in the judgement on the basis of those contentions. There is no good ground for review of the judgement because of the orders issued in May, 1992 revising the pay of the applicant fixed earlier.

3. In the light of the foregoing discussions, we find no merit in this R.A. and the same is accordingly rejected. By circulation.

J. P. Sharma
(J.P. SHARMA)
Member (J)

P. C. Jain
(P.C. JAIN)
Vice-Chairman
Chandigarh Bench